



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

earth and good-will to men," and glory to God, and belonging, as we do, to a nation of freemen, whose policy is open, honorable and pacific, we cannot but regard favorably, a society which is the offspring of the pure gospel, and therefore extend to it our best wishes and cordial support.

JOHN LEDNUM,  
JOSEPH CASTLE,  
J. H. McFARLON, } *Committee.*

*Milford, Del. April 10th, 1845.*

---

#### SPECIMENS OF THE PERIODICAL PRESS.

IS THIS THE MILLENNIUM?—We know there is always a disposition to magnify present events. Not unfrequently men think they find themselves, or the events which affect them, plainly described in the visions of Scripture prophets. But allowing for this propensity, there is certainly something entirely new in the present state of the world. That most distinct and oft-repeated prophetic declaration, that men should beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, and learn war no more, is fulfilled to the letter. Such a declaration required a bold man to make it; for it was in direct contradiction to the whole current of human policy from the fall of Adam to the day it was made; and until recently there has been no sign of its accomplishment. To be sure, the great nations of the world have at times suspended their slaughter of each other; but it has never been for the *reasons* which govern now. The policy of kings has ever been warlike, and peace has been a matter of necessity; a breathing time in which to gain vigor for further conflict. When some hero has subjugated all who opposed him, there has been peace; but it has only been that the smothered fires might burst out with new fury at another time. Warriors have sometimes been so evenly matched in their means of destruction, that fear has kept them at bay; but never until now, was peace the *policy* of the world, its settled, fixed determination to which all other policy was made subservient. Much less was such a policy ever based upon sound moral views of right and wrong. Peace never before was the fashion, the policy of honor, and war a disgrace to whoever should make it, or give cause for it. In all these respects, the peace which we now enjoy, is upon new principles; principles entirely different from those which have caused the cessation of war at former periods. These principles are as eternal as truth, and their influence must be constantly increasing.

It is now almost thirty years since the termination of the wars of Napoleon. That generation of warriors has, in a great measure, passed off from the active scenes of influence. The wonderful discoveries and inventions of the past half century have increased the relative powers of defence, and made conquest more difficult. They have also rendered human life more important, and multiplied the means of honorable enterprise in the arts of peace. Above all, they have multiplied the means of communication, of discussion, and the interchange of opinions, and the diffusion of intelligence. Through the newspapers and periodicals the masses now speak their opinions, and with an influence hitherto unknown. The public good, the benefit of the people at large, has cause to be counted as a great, nay, *the* great matter to be considered. The interests of government are seen to be nothing when put in opposition to the interests of the people, and governments have found out that their interests are identical with those of the people. War is seen in all its deformity as the destroyer of the people and the governments together; and peace as the great friend of both. While peace prevails, men are employed in production; in war they are employed in destroying. In peace expenses are comparatively light, and the revenue easily collected. The truth on the subject has been manifest. The world has gained every thing by peace, and lost every thing by war. In the cool, deliberate opinion

of the world, war has been condemned, and to engage in it is made disgraceful. The governments of civilized nations now constitute one great combination for the preservation of universal peace. The causes which have brought about this benign change, are every day operating with greater and still greater force. The quarrels of nations are now discussed in the journals, and war is unnecessary. This is a state of things which never existed before; and although large armies and navies are still maintained on what is called a "peace establishment," they are more wanted to ensure domestic quiet than to resist foreign aggression. But the uselessness of these preparations is every day becoming more apparent; and we trust they will, at no distant period, be abandoned, or, at least, turned, like the war steamers, into the carrying of mails and other pursuits of industry, never to be recalled.

This rich and beautiful extract from a late editorial in the *Journal of Commerce*, deserves to be pondered well by the whole community. The continuance of general peace in Christendom beyond any former example;—the new and permanent principles on which this peace is founded;—peace now the policy, the fashion, the glory of nations once the most warlike in the world;—the complete revolution, the thorough and radical change of men's views on this subject;—the influences now at work in favor of general and permanent peace; these and other points suggested, demand the attention of the philanthropist and patriot.

JUST VIEWS FROM A STATESMAN.—"No more negotiations!" exclaims Hon. Robert C. Winthrop in his speech on the Oregon question; "Why, where is such a doctrine as this to lead us? Inevitably to war. To war with England now; to war with all the world hereafter, or, certainly, with all parts of the world with which we may have controversies of any sort. And even war can never put an end to the necessity of negotiation. Unless war is to be perpetual, you must come back to negotiation in the end. The only question in the case before us—the only question in every case of disputed international rights,—is not whether you will negotiate or fight, but whether you will negotiate only, or negotiate and fight both. Battles will never settle boundaries between Great Britain and the United States, in Oregon, or elsewhere. The capture of ships, the destruction of commerce, the burning and plundering of cities, will leave us just where we commenced. First or last, negotiation alone can settle this question. For one, therefore, I am for negotiation first, before war, and without war. I believe that we shall get quite as much of Oregon in this way; and I know that we shall get it at less expense, not merely of money, but of all that makes up the true welfare and honor of our country.

"Sir, the reckless flippancy with which war is spoken of in this House and elsewhere, as a thing to be 'let come,' rather than wait for the issue of negotiations, is deserving, in my judgment, of the severest rebuke and reprobation from every Christian patriot and statesman. I say, *let it not come, let it never come*, if any degree of honorable patience and forbearance will avert it. I protest against any course of proceeding which shall invite or facilitate its approach. I protest against it, in behalf of the commerce of the nation, so considerable a part of which I have the honor to represent. I protest against it, in the name of the public morality and religion, which ought to be represented by every member on this floor. I protest against it, also, in the spirit of a true republican democracy. My venerable colleague (Mr. Adams) alluded yesterday to the old and well-known correspondence of James Madison and Alexander Hamilton, under the signatures of Helvidius and Pacificus, and expressed his wish that it might be freshly read by all who took an interest in ascertaining the just limitations of Executive power. I cordially respond to that sentiment. But I will venture to say, that no one will read these letters without being struck with the force, the

beauty, the consummate justness and truth of a warning against war, which one of those letters contains, and which constitutes the crown jewel of the whole series:—‘ War is, in fact (says James Madison), the true nurse of Executive aggrandizement. In war a physical force is to be created, and it is the Executive will which is to direct it. In war the public treasures are to be unlocked, and it is the Executive hand which is to dispense them. In war the honors and emoluments of office are to be multiplied, and it is the Executive patronage under which they are to be enjoyed. It is in war, finally, that laurels are to be gathered, and it is the Executive brow they are to encircle. The strongest passions and most dangerous weaknesses of the human breast,—ambition, avarice, vanity, the honorable or venial love of fame,—are all in conspiracy against the desire and the duty of peace. Hence it has grown into an axiom, that the Executive is the department of power most distinguished by its propensity to war; hence it is the practice of all states, *in proportion as they are free*, to disarm this propensity of its influence.’—Such is the noble testimony which was borne by one of the fathers of our country, half a century ago, to the anti-republican tendencies of war. And it is of this “true nurse of Executive aggrandizement,” that gentlemen are so continually crying, ‘let it come!’ Such a cry is not only inconsistent with sound republicanism and true morality, but it is to the last degree puerile. I intend no disrespect to any gentleman who hears me; but, as I have listened to the heroic strains which have resounded through this hall for some days past, in reference to the facility with which we could muster our fleets in the Pacific, and march our armies over the Rocky Mountains, and whip Great Britain into a willingness to abandon her pretensions to Oregon, I have wished that some Philip Faulconbridge were here to reply, as he does in Shakspeare’s King John, to some swaggering citizen of Angiers,—

——— “Here’s a large mouth indeed,  
That spits forth death and mountains, rocks and seas;  
Talks as familiarly of roaring lions,  
As maids of thirteen do of puppy-dogs.  
He speaks plain cannon, fire and smoke, and bounce!”

And against whom are all these gasconading bravadoes indulged? What nation has been thus bethumpt and bastinadoed with brave words! I have no compliments to bestow on Great Britain, and am not here as her apologist or defender. But this, at least, I can say, without fear of imputation or impugment, that, of all the nations in the world, she is that nation which is able to do us the most good in peace, and the most harm in war. She is that nation with whom the best interests of our country imperatively demand of us to go along harmoniously, so long as we can do so without a sacrifice of unquestioned right and honor. She is that nation, a belligerent conflict with whom would put back the cause of human civilization and improvement more than it has advanced in a half century past, or would recover in a half century to come. Peace between Great Britain and the United States is not a mere interest of the two countries. It is an interest of the world, of civilization, of humanity; and a fearful reckoning will be theirs who shall wantonly disturb it.

In this view, Mr. Chairman, I cannot help deploring the principle of *hatred towards England*, which seems to have been recently inscribed by not a few of our public men, as the first article of their political creed. There are those with whom a fling at Great Britain appears to be the principal study of all their oratory, and who seem to regard no argument complete, which does not contain some denunciation of her grasping policy, or her spurious philanthropy. They seem to have adopted, in reference to England, the maxim which Lord Nelson is related to have inculcated towards France, in his advice to some of the midshipmen under his command—“There are three things, said he, which you are constantly to bear in mind: first, you must always implicitly obey orders, without attempting to form any

opinion of your own respecting their propriety ; secondly, you must consider every man your enemy who speaks ill of your king ; and thirdly, *you must hate a Frenchman as you hate the devil.*" Such a maxim might be pardoned, perhaps to soldiers and sailors, on the eve of an engagement in mortal combat with their foes ; but it is the last which ought to be entertained by those who are trusted with the power and the duty of pacific legislation.

---

#### SENTIMENTS OF EMINENT MEN ON PEACE.

We can quote here only a few specimens of the sentiments which Mr. Foster collected from church and state.

GENERAL SCOTT.—If war be the natural state of savage tribes, peace is the first want of every civilized community. War, no doubt, is, under any circumstances, a great calamity ; yet submission to outrage would often be a greater calamity. Of the two parties to any war, one, at least, must be in the wrong—not unfrequently both. An error in such an issue is, on the part of chief magistrates, ministers of state, and legislators, having a voice in the question, a crime of infinite magnitude. The murder of an individual by an individual, is, in guilt, comparatively but a drop of blood.

Hence, the highest moral obligation to treat national differences with temper, justice and fairness ; to see that the cause of war is, not only just, but sufficient ; to be sure that we do not covet our neighbor's land, "nor any thing that is his ;"—that we are as ready to give as to demand explanation, apology, indemnity. In short, we should especially remember, "all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." This divine precept is of universal obligation. It is as applicable to rulers in their transactions with other nations, as to private individuals in their daily intercourse with each other. Power is entrusted to the former to do good, and to avoid evil. Such, clearly, is the revealed will of God.

MR. CALHOUN.—It is well known that I am the advocate of peace with all, and especially with that great country from whence we draw our origin, and of whose renown we may well be proud. There are no other countries which can do more harm to each other, or confer greater benefits, the one on the other. But as highly as I value peace, I hold it subordinate to the honor and just rights of the country ; while, on the other hand, no consideration shall induce me to sacrifice the peace of the country by claiming more, in the discharge of my duties, than I shall honestly believe that the honor and rights of the country demand. Her true honor and interest consist, according to my conception, in claiming nothing but what is just and right, and in accepting nothing that is not.

EX-PRESIDENT ADAMS AND OTHERS.—We believe that universal and permanent peace belongs to the laws of nature and of nature's God ; to the genius and vital spirit of Christianity ; to the liberty, justice and prosperity of nations ; indispensable to the true interests of all mankind, and claiming the prayers and united efforts of all the friends of the human race.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

The following gentlemen subscribed the sentiment :—HENRY CLAY, of Ashland. Of the United States Senate :—Isaac C. Bates, Rufus Choate, Mass. ; Wm. D. Merrick, Md. ; Wm. Woodbridge, Mich. ; Henry Johnson, Lou. ; J. W. Huntington, Conn. ; J. W. Miller, N. J. ; Samuel S. Phelps, Vt. ; Albion K. Parris, late Senator from Maine ; Henry L. Ellsworth, Commissioner of Patents ; Charles B. Penrose, Solicitor of the Treasury ; Robert C. Winthrop, M. C. of Boston ; W. S. Hubbell, M. C. of N. Y. ; P. Dillingham, M. C. of Vt.

With the strongest conviction of the truth, justice and beauty of the above sentiment in favor of peace, I add my name to that of the venerable author of these sentiments.—D. D. Barnard, M. C. of Albany ; Luther Bradish, N. Y. ; W. B. Crosby, N. Y. ; C. P. Smith, Brooklyn.